DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 807 SP 026 138

AUTHOR Schuttenberg, Ernest M; And Others
TITLE Self-Perceptions of Productivity of Education Faculty: Life Phase and Gender Differences.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Aspiration; Administrative Policy; *Career Development; Higher Education; *Scholarship; *Self Concept; Sex Differences; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Educators; Vocational Maturity

ABSTRACT

The perceptions of college of education faculty members of their achievements and future potential at various life cycle and career phases were investigated. Survey questionnaires were sent to 391 college of education faculty members from 38 institutions. Findings emphasized the primacy of teaching in their perceptions for productivity. Scholarship was found to be an important component, especially among the younger faculty, who also rated their future scholarship potential higher than their older colleagues. More females than males saw scholarship becoming more important in their definitions of productivity. Nearly half of the respondents indicated that their conceptions of what constituted productivity had changed over the course of their careers. For those who changed their perceptions of productivity, teaching held about the same importance, while scholarship and service assumed significantly greater importance. A greater percentage of female respondents saw positive change in the importance of scholarship. Male respondents rated themselves higher in past scholarship performance. Institutional policies and procedures were seen as hindering more than enhancing faculty productivity. Data on findings are presented in tables, and a copy of the survey questionnaire is included. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257807

Self-Perceptions of Productivity of Education Faculty: Life Phase and Gender Differences

Ernest M. Schuttenberg

Lewis E. Patterson

Rosemary E. Sutton

Cleveland State University

For presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, March 31 to April 4, 1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E.M. Schuttenberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

This study investigated the perceptions of college of education faculty members about their achievements and future potential in relation to life/career phase and gender. Specifically, the study explored the following questions:

1. How do faculty members define "productivity" as it applies to their jobs?

2. How do faculty members rate their past, present, and future productivity in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and do these ratings vary with age, gender, rank, and number of years in current rank?

3. To what extent have their definitions of productivity changed over the course of their careers?

4. How do organizational policies and procedures affect faculty productivity?

The sample consisted of 391 College of Education faculty members from 38 institutions. Twenty questionnaires were mailed to each of 40 colleges of Education belonging to the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities (TECSCU) in 28 states. The return rate was 51%. The age range of the respondents was 27 to 67 years with the median age 47 years. Sixty-five percent of the respondents were male, 75% were tenured, 40% were full professors, 32% were associate professors, and 21% were assistant professors.

The findings of this study emphasized the primacy of teaching in the perceptions of productivity of college of education faculty members. Scholarship was found to be an important component, especially among the younger faculty members, who also rated their future scholarship potential higher than their older colleagues. More females than males saw scholarship becoming more important in their definitions of productivity.

Nearly half of the respondents in the study indicated that their conceptions of what constituted productivity had changed over the course of their careers. For those who changed their conceptions of productivity it was found that teaching held about the same importance, while scholarship and service had assumed significantly greater importance. A greater percentage of female respondents saw positive change in the importance of scholarship. Male respondents rated themselves higher in past scholarship performance. Finally, institutional policies and procedures were seen as hindering more than enhancing faculty productivity.

Self-Perceptions of Productivity of Education Faculty: Life Phase and Gender Differences

The field of college teaching has always been a desirable one. Opportunities for working with bright students of all ages, high status in the community, the challenge of conducting research and publishing scholarly writings, the chance to control, to a great extent, one's work assignment and schedule, and a relatively high salary level have all contributed to the desirability of the occupation.

Over the past decade, however, the quality of academic life has changed in significant ways. Faculty in colleges of education have been particularly affected by changes in organizational priorities, curtailment of career mobility, and increasing difficulty in the attainment of promotion and tenure. The spate of recent critical reports about the condition of teacher preparation programs and calls for increases in the effectiveness of faculty members in colleges of education have increased the pressures for high productivity.

The present study investigated the perceptions of college of education faculty members of their achievements and future potential at various life cycle and career phases. Specifically, the study explored the following questions:

1. How do faculty members define "productivity" as it applies to their jobs?

2. How do faculty members rate their past, present, and future productivity in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and do these ratings vary with age, gender, rank, and number of years in current rank?

3. To what extent have their definitions of productivity changed over the course of their careers?

4. How do organizational policies and procedures affect faculty productivity?

Theoretical Framework

The Aging of Faculties

At the end of World War II colleges and universities geared up to serve the educational needs of returning veterans. During the late fifties and early sixties the growth mode in higher education was sustained by the decisions of more young adults to seek a college education and by increased access to education by minorities and the poor. Then came the baby boom. Higher education was a growth industry during the tenure of most currently employed university faculty members.

The baby boom was followed by a period when the birth rate declined, and when the number of couples of child-bearing age diminished. The cohort of eighteen year olds became smaller, and colleges and universities began looking for non-traditional students to bolster their ranks. Even though there was some success in attracting new students, the growth of college

populations slowed to a virtual stop, and enrollment began to show a long predicted decline.

The aging of faculty is one of the outcomes of the decline in growth of the student population. Since classes are not expanding, there is little need for additional faculty except in certain newly developing fields. Incumbent faculty stay in place and get older. George & Winfield-Laird (1984, p. 6) summarized the aging of faculties as follows:

> In 1968-69, the median age of college faculty members was thirty-nine (Bayer, 1970); in 1972-73, the median age of college faculty members was forty (Corwin and Knepper, 1978); and by 1978-79, the median age of college faculty was forty-five (National Science Foundation, 1981a). Indeed, researchers predict that the median age of college faculty will continue to rise until the end of the century (Cartter, 1976; Corwin and Knepper, 1978).

Since most college faculty members are currently middle-aged, no substantial turnover of personnel can be anticipated in the near future. Colleges will continue to have aging faculties until at least 1990.

Nature of the Academic Lifestyle: Stifling or Motivating?

Since it seems apparent that college and university faculties will be staffed by seasoned professors, it is important to understand how length of service may impact upon faculty

productivity. There is folklore in academe that adds little clarity to what may be expected. One view is that younger faculty enroute to tenure and at the peak of their physical and mental capacities are most productive; another view is that seasoned scholars are able to address more profound questions with the advantage of experience.

The literature on the nature of the academic lifestyle and its effects on productivity does not shed much light on the question of the impact of time in position. Brookes & German (1983) see a great potential for malaise to set in as the years pass.

> Faculty soon catch on to the fundamentally unchanging nature of their work. With the exception of special projects, what a faculty member does one year is pretty much what he or she will do the next year and the year after and the year after (p. 19).

These authors maintain that academe very much needs but rarely provides the opportunity to diversify. Even most of the faculty development efforts that have been undertaken are not seen as changing faculty lifestyles in fundamental ways. Research is encouraged and rewarded, but teaching remains the predominate activity for most faculty.

Finkelstein (1984), on the other hand, reached a much more optimistic conclusion from his research on the American academic

profession. He concluded that professors were extraordinarily free to govern their work lives according to their own professional standards and values. Job satisfaction is seen as intrinsic; where dissatisfaction occurs it is attributed to external factors such as organizational or supervisor problems. The professor is seen as a professional who usually has the power to renew his/her work life on a cyclical basis by undertaking new and different tasks.

It seems probable that both Brookes & German's view and Finkelstein's view are descriptive of some faculty. Some professors enter the academic career full of energy and excitement, only to become bored as time passes. Others solve the problem of potential boredom by exercising their power to vary their work agenda.

Life-Stage Theory: Implications for Faculty Careers

Erik Erikson's (1963) model of eight stages of human life included three states that addressed adulthood, each characterized by a different focus of activity and resulting in the potential for different kinds of satisfactions. Young adults were described as devoted to intimacy tasks, that is establishing affiliations with the adult world in both the love and work dimensions of life. Middle adults were seen as becoming more involved with generativity--bringing on the next generation--and making a contribution to others. Senior adults were described as

devoting energies to life review for evidence that they had lived meaningfully.

Subsequent research (Gould, 1978; Levinson, 1978; Fiske, 1980) addressed transitions through adult life stages and accumulated evidence generally supportive of Erikson's hypothetical work while elaborating on the specific nature of adult life experience. Through the study of male populations, Gould and Levinson each created more elaborate life-stage structures than Erikson proposed. They described in more detail the process of leaving the parental home, living as a "provisional adult' until about age thirty, opening up and becoming independently productive after age thirty, reassessing commitments at midlife, restabilizing for more productive years, and then passing a transition to late adulthood.

Fiske, on the other hand, has studied both women and men across varied social strata and has cautioned against an overly rigid application of stage theory. While acknowledging Erikson's theory as useful, she has found less uniformity in her heterogeneous samples than Gould and Levinson saw in their samples of relatively well educated men. Clearly women demonstrate a variety of life/career patterns that are influenced in important ways by the choices they make about family participation (Super, 1978).

Several recent publications have used adult life-stage

theory as a structure for examining the aging process of college and university faculty (Cytrynbaum, Lee, & Wadner, 1982; Brookes & German, 1983; Mehrotra 1984). Each of these publications suggests the strategy of increasing faculty productivity and satisfaction through faculty development programs that recognize and accommodate the developmental needs of faculty members at different stages in the life span. Such programs might provide opportunities for young faculty to affiliate with mentors, for mid-career faculty to develop more independent colleague relationships as well as mentor relationships, and for senior faculty to engage in sponsorship and organizational change initiatives. Authors also recommend supportive supervision and time out arrangements for persons struggling with life transitions.

Productivity and Satisfaction as a Function of Life Stage, Age, or Gender

Though there is some logic to a conception of faculty careers based on adult development theory, the empirical study of careers across the life cycle is in its infancy. Studies generally were accomplished with small local populations that were skewed by their selection. Even the Gould and Levinson populations were selected so strongly on the basis of convenience that the generalization of findings must be undertaken with care.

A study of professional engineers (Dalton, Thompson, &

Price, 1977) related performance, age, and life stage in an interesting way. Their initial finding, with a population of 2,500 engineers in seven large organizations, showed a negative correlation between age and performance ratings after age 35. However, not all the older engineers had low ratings, and the top third of the sample over fifty were nearly as highly rated as the top third in any age group.

In order to understand these apparently discrepant findings, the researchers superimposed a career stage model on a subsequent study of performance. They began by defining four career stages, which may be identified by the primary relationships of the workers: apprentice, colleague, mentor, and sponsor. For each of the four stages, certain tasks or activities and psychological shifts were identified. The authors hypothesized that those engineers who successfully navigated the transitions of all four stages would remain productive while those who continued to behave like more junior employees would become less and less effective.

They tested the hypothesis by asking the managers in two research and development organizations to assign each person in their departments into one of the four stages. Then they compared the stage assigned with performance for all workers over the age of 40. Support for their hypothesis was strong: none of the employees who was classified at the apprentice stage and over

40 years of age achieved an above average performance rating, while all of those who had been classified at the sponsor stage achieved such a rating. Those at the colleague and mentor stages had approximately 20% and 80% above average ratings respectively.

In a study of gender differences and self-ratings of productivity among college professors, Widom & Burke (1978) found that men rated themselves significantly higher than women on reputation as teachers, on publication records, and on professional reputation. No difference was found in self-assessment of cognitive ability. Men were more accurate in their estimation of scholarly productivity than women as shown by actual numbers of publications.

Summary

There is a preponderance of evidence that the ages of college and university faculties have been increasing since the late 1960's and that they will likely continue to do so for some time to come. There is little agreement about the impact of the faculty lifestyle on productivity and work satisfaction over the life span. Adult life-stage theory suggests that people may be motivated in different ways at different times in their lives. Research studies on professional adults at different life stages suggest that there may be differences in actual and perceived productivity that are stage related. There is also some evidence that there may be gender differences in perceived productivity

that could be related to the different socialization and life patterns of males and females.

Method

Sample

The sample in the present study consisted of 391 College of Education faculty members from 38 institutions. Twenty questionnaires were mailed to the Deans of 40 colleges of Education belonging to the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities (TECSCU) in 28 states. The Deans were asked to distribute the questionnaires. No returns were received from two of the colleges, and it is assumed the questionnaires were not distributed. The return rate was 51%. Sixty-five percent of the respondents were male, 75% were tenured, 40% were full professors, 32% were associate professors, and 21% were assistant professors.

The age range of the respondents was 27 to 67 years with the median age 47 years. Faculty were divided into three age groups for purposes of comparison: age under 40, 40 - 54, and 55 and beyond. These age ranges were chosen to establish a youngest group still in the establishment stage of their professional careers, a middle group that one would expect to find in the generative period of their careers, and a senior group that might be looking toward retirement.

Instrument

A questionnaire of 19 items (The Faculty Career Survey) was developed and pilot tested. The questions relevant to this paper focused on three areas: perceptions of productivity, effects of institutional policies, and demographic information. Perceptions of productivity were assessed in several ways: (a) an open ended question on the perception of productivity, "When you think of your job, what does being productive mean to you?"; (b) a series of nine questions that asked respondents to rate their own productivity on a 9-point scale from low to high in the past, present and future in scholarship, teaching, and service; and (c) a question asking about changes in conceptions of productivity, "Has your conception of productivity changed since you took an academic job?" If the respondents checked "yes," they were asked to explain how it had changed. The effects of institutional policies on productivity were assessed with one open-ended question, "What effects, positive and negative, have your institutions' procedures had on your ability to be productive?" Finally, a series of questions asked demographic information such as age, gender, academic rank, area of expertise, and number of years in a full-time academic position. See the Appendix for a copy of the questionnaire.

Content Analysis

The open ended questions were content analyzed. The

responses to the question on conceptions of productivity were classified as mentioning scholarship, teaching, service, or combinations of these. The percentage of agreement between two scorers was 83%. The responses to the question on changes in perceptions of productivity were classified as no change, increase, decrease, or no mention of the three areas of teaching, research and service. Percentage of agreement between two scorers was 75%. The responses to the question on institutional influences were classified as positive, negative, both positive and negative, or no effect. Percentage agreement between two scorers was 91%.

Results and Discussion

Perceptions of Productivity

The first research question explored how faculty members defined "productivity" as it applied to their jobs. The vast majority (79%) of respondents included teaching as a component of their definitions. Smaller percentages included scholarship (56%) and service (50%). In addition, the idea of meeting one's own standards or satisfying one's own goals was mentioned by one in five of the respondents as part of their definitions of productivity.

The relationship between age and the respondents' inclusion of scholarship in their definitions of productivity was significant ($\chi^2 = 13.27$, $df = 2$, $p < .005$). In the younger age

group (less than 40 years), 70% of the respondents included scholarship compared to 57% of the middle age group (40 to 54 years) and 44% of the older age group (55 years and above). There were no statisically significant differences in respondents' definitions of productivity based on gender, academic rank, tenure, years of service, or field of expertise.

The finding in the present study that nearly four in five respondents included teaching in their definitions of productivity may reflect the tenacity of the traditional college of education emphasis on teaching. Those college of education faculty members most likely to include scholarship in their conceptions of what constitutes productivity were those in the youngest age grouping (less than 40 years) and those least likely to include scholarship were in the oldest age group (55 years and above). It would appear from these findings that the message of the importance of scholarship to the career of college of education faculty members has been taken to heart by those at the earlier stages of such a career.

Ratings of Productivity

The next question of interest was how faculty members rated their past, present, and future productivity in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of these self-ratings. Mean ratings were significantly higher than the scale mean of 5.0 for all nine

areas combined--past, present, and future for teaching, scholarship, and service (MANOVA: Hotellings T: $F = 280.4$, $df = 9,191$, $p < .001$) and for each area separately (all were significant at the .001 level). These findings suggest that respondents held generally favorable opinions about their productivity.

Insert Table 1 about here

Disregarding time frame, mean self-ratings for teaching were highest, followed by service and then scholarship (MANOVA: Hotellings T: $F = 64.98$, $df = 6,378$, $p < .001$). Disregarding category of productivity, mean self-ratings were higher for present than past and higher for future than present (MANOVA: Hotellings T: $F = 24.15$, $df = 6$, $p < .001$). Respondents believed their performance improved over time and will continue to improve.

Difference in Self-Ratings of Productivity by Age, Gender, Rank, and Years in Rank

The next area of analysis examined differences in ratings of productivity by age, gender, rank, and number of years in current rank. This was done by conducting three separate MANOVAS, one for scholarship, one for teaching and one for service. If the MANOVA was significant, followup univariate tests and post hoc tests were conducted.

The multivariate tests for self-ratings of scholarship by age was significant (Hotellings T: $F = 4.62$, $df = 6,666$, $p < .0001$). The three univariate tests for past, present, and future were also all significant (see Table 2). The youngest group of faculty rated their future scholarship significantly more favorably than the middle and oldest groups (Scheffé post hoc test $p < .01$). The ratings of future scholarship of the middle and oldest groups were not significantly different from each other. It was expected that the youngest groups would rate their future scholarship higher than the other two groups as they have the longest period of years remaining to accomplish additional scholarship. The post hoc followup tests for present and future scholarship were not significant.

Insert Table 2 about here

There were no statistically significant age differences in self-ratings of teaching or of service.

Several gender differences in self-ratings of productivity were found, and they are summarized in Table 3. The multivariate test for scholarship by gender was significant (Hotellings T: $F = 4.27$, $df = 3,334$, $p < .01$). Only one univariate test was significant. This was for past scholarship ($F = 3.92$, $df = 1,336$, $p < .05$) with males rating themselves higher than

females. This finding is consistent with the Widom and Burke (1978) study.

Insert Table 3 about here

The multivariate tests for teaching and service were both significant (Hotellings T: $F = 3.25$, $df = 3,332$, $p < .05$ for teaching; Hotellings T: $F = 3.75$, $df = 3,257$, $p < .05$ for service). Univariate tests indicated that females rated themselves higher on present and future teaching and present service (see Table 3). There was no significant difference in ratings of past teaching. The Widom and Burke (1978) study showed that males believed they had better reputations (i.e., self-ratings of past teaching) than did women.

There were significant age by gender interactions for both present and future teaching ($F = 6.15$, $df = 2,334$, $p < .01$ for present teaching; $F = 3.89$, $df = 2,334$, $p < .05$ for future teaching). Younger women and older men rated themselves higher as teachers than did older women and younger men for both present and future.

The gender differences in self-ratings of productivity that were found would have been difficult to predict from the adult development literature. If one were to attempt to attribute the differences to personal priorities of male and female faculty, it

would appear that the men have placed more emphasis on their writing, while women have placed more emphasis on day-to-day teaching and the operation of the institution. The age by gender interaction is consistent with the theory that males become more focused on the nurturant element of personality, i.e. teaching, with increasing age, while women, freed from the activities of childrearing, become less nurturant in orientation and expend more energy on competitive achievement, i.e. scholarship, (Gutmann, 1964, 1975). However, a complementary age/gender interaction with scholarship was not found.

No statistically significant differences in self-rating by rank and years in rank were identified.

Relationship Between Perceptions of Productivity and Self-Ratings of Productivity

The relationship between the responses from the open-ended question on perceptions of productivity in teaching and the self-ratings of productivity in teaching was tested in the following way. The respondents were divided into two groups, those mentioning scholarship spontaneously, and those not mentioning scholarship in their conception of productivity. Differences between these two groups on self-ratings of present scholarship were tested using an Analysis of Variance. An identical procedure was used for conceptions and ratings of scholarship and service.

The faculty who had included scholarship in their definition of productivity were more likely to rate their own scholarship performance higher ($F = 19.4$, $df = 1,380$, $p < .001$) than those who did not mention scholarship. Similarly, those who mentioned service in their definitions had higher self-ratings on service ($F = 13.39$, $df = 1,380$, $p < .001$).

No significant relationship between the mention of teaching in the definition of productivity and the rating of teaching was found ($p > .6$).

These results suggest a high degree of self consistency in the way respondents answered the questionnaire. Those who specifically mentioned research or service on the open-ended question were more likely to rate their performance in these areas positively. Since teaching was mentioned by such a large majority (79%) of respondents, it may be concluded that teaching held importance among most faculty in the institutions surveyed and those specifically mentioning teaching do not differ in their ratings from those who do not.

Changes in Conceptions of Productivity

In response to the question on the Faculty Career Survey asking whether respondents' conceptions of productivity had changed since they first took an academic job, approximately half (49%) said a change had occurred (see Table 4). Of those who had changed their conception of productivity, only 26% said that the

importance of teaching had changed. Slightly more respondents said that teaching had become less important than those who said it had become more important.

Insert Table 4 about here

Of those who indicated a change in overall conception of productivity, 46% reported that they now saw scholarship differently from earlier in their careers. Of these respondents, three times as many reported that the importance of scholarship had increased than reported that it had decreased. Thirty percent of these respondents indicated that their conception of the importance of service had changed, again with three times as many reporting an increase in importance compared to those reporting a decrease.

There were some differences by gender and age in how respondents saw the emphasis on scholarship changing. Females increased their emphasis on scholarship more than males (see Table 5). When placed in the context of the males having rated their past performance superior to females, this could indicate that the females belatedly have become aware of scholarship as a part of the professorial role and are seeking to close the gap.

Insert Table 5 about here

Members of the oldest cohort differed from the younger two groups in deemphasizing service (see Table 6). Service was apparently more important during the career phase when reputations were being established than later in life.

Insert Table 6 about here

No statistically significant differences were found in the patterns of responses on changes in conceptions of productivity by academic rank, tenure status, years in position, or field of expertise.

Effect of Organizational Policies

The majority of faculty believed that institutional policies had a negative effect on their productivity. Over 44% of the respondents stated that policies had a purely negative effect and 34% stated that policies had both a negative and positive effect. Only 16% of the respondents believed that institutions had a purely positive effect (see Table 7).

Insert Table 7 about here

There was a significant relationship between rank and perceptions of institutional policies on productivity (χ^2 = 15.0, df = 6, $p < .05$), with faculty of lower rank having more

negative perceptions than those of higher rank. Only 10% of assistant professors saw the policies as purely positive compared with 25% of full professors. Over half of the assistant professors saw policies as purely negative compared with 39% of the full professors (see Table 7).

There was also a significant relationship between gender and perceptions of institutional policies on productivity (χ^2 = 14.9, df = 3, $p < .01$). Approximately the same percentage of males (13%) and females (18%) saw institutional policies as purely positive, but more males (51%) saw policies as purely negative than did females (36%). A higher percentage of females (46%) saw policies as both negative and positive than did males (26%).

Conclusions

Nearly four-fifths of the respondents in this study included teaching in their conceptions of productivity in response to an open-ended question. Only about half included scholarship and about the same proportion included service. More than one in five respondents also mentioned satisfaction of one's own goals or standards in their conceptions of productivity.

Faculty members younger than 40 years were more likely to include scholarship in their conceptions of productivity than were their older colleagues. Those respondents 55 years or older were the least likely to include scholarship. These findings may

represent cohort differences regarding priorities in colleges of education over the last two or three decades, reflecting greater external pressure in recent years for scholarship achievement in order to earn promotion and tenure. Another interpretation of these findings is that the younger faculty are more scholarship-oriented than their older colleagues because of more rigorous graduate training in research methodologies.

On the nine-point self-rating scales of past, present, and future productivity, respondents generally rated themselves above the mean. Highest self-ratings were assigned for teaching with service a close second and scholarship lowest. Respondents believed their performance improved over time and will continue to improve.

The only statistically significant age difference in self-ratings identified was that the youngest group rated their future potential for scholarship higher than did the other two groups. It may be that not only have the younger professors accepted the inevitability of scholarship, but they have assigned it high value in their future careers, again, perhaps, because of the emphasis in their graduate training.

Gender differences in self-ratings revealed that females perceived themselves to be more productive as teachers presently and in the future, and that they also believed they are more productive in the service component. Males' self-ratings were

higher only in the past scholarship area.

Respondents who included scholarship and service in their conception of productivity on the open-ended question also rated themselves higher in these areas on the rating scales. No similar relationship occurred for teaching, perhaps because teaching was taken for granted as part of the faculty role for nearly 80% of the respondents.

Nearly half of the respondents in the study indicated that their conceptions of what constituted productivity had changed over the course of their careers. For those who changed their conceptions of productivity it was found that teaching held about the same importance, while scholarship and service had assumed significantly greater importance. A greater percentage of female respondents saw more change in the importance of scholarship, a result, perhaps, of a perceived need for women faculty to "work harder" to catch up with male colleagues, whose self-ratings in this study indicated stronger past performance.

With regard to the impact of institutional policies and procedures on faculty productivity, the majority of respondents felt they had a negative effect. Males and younger faculty were more negative in their perceptions, while females and older faculty were less negative.

In summary, the findings of this study emphasized the primacy of teaching in the perceptions of productivity of college

of education faculty members. Scholarship was found to be an important component, especially among the younger faculty members, who also rated their future scholarship potential higher than their older colleagues. More females than males saw scholarship becoming more important in their definitions of productivity. Finally, institutional policies and procedures were seen as hindering more than enhancing faculty productivity.

Suggestions for Further Study

The study of productivity of college faculty members is important, considering the heightened concern of our society for quality and accountability in education. This exploratory study suggested several additional research activities, the most significant of which follow:

1. Extend the investigation to include faculty in other disciplines.

2. Include measures of actual productivity as a frame of reference for understanding self-perceptions.

3. Through interviews or case studies investigate the motives and thought processes that underlie self-ratings of productivity.

REFERENCES

Baldwin, R. G. (1984). The changing development needs of an aging professoriate. In C. M. N. Mehrota, (Ed.) Teaching and Aging, SanFrancisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookes, M. C. T. & German, K. L. (1983). Meeting the challenges: Developing faculty careers. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 3. Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education.

Dalton, G. W., Thompson, P. H. & Price, R. I. The four stages of professional careers: A new look at performance by professionals. Organizational Dynamics, Summer, 1977, 19-42.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and society, (2nd ed). New York: W. W. Norton.

Finkelstein, M. J. (1984). The American Academic Profession. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Fiske, M. (1980). Changing hierarchies of commitment in adulthood. In N. J. Smelser and E. H. Erikson, (Eds.) Themes of work and love in adulthood Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

George, L. K. & Winfield-Laird, I. (1984). Implications of an aging faculty for the quality of higher education and academic careers. In C. M. N. Mehrotra, (ed.), Teaching and aging, SanFrancisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gould, R. L. (1978). Transformations: Growth and change in adult life. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Gutmann, D. L. (1964). An explanation of ego configurations in middle and later life. In B. L. Neugarten & Associates (Eds.), Personality in middle and later life. New York: Atherton Press.

Gutmann, D. L. (1975). Parenthood, the key to comparative study of the life cycle. In N. Daton and L. Ginsberg (Eds.), Life-span developmental psychology: Normative life crises. New York: Academic Press.

Levenson, D. J. et al. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Mehrota, C. M. N. (1984). Teaching and aging. SanFrancisco: Jossey-Bass.

Strumpf, S. A. & Rabinowitz, S. (1981). Career stage as a moderator of performance relationships with facets of job satisfaction and role perceptions. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18, 202-218.

Super, D. E. (1978). Career patterns and life stages. In L. S. Hansen & R. S. Raposa (Eds.), Career development and counseling of women. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1978. (From The psychology of careers, 1957.

Widom, C. S. & Burke, B. W. (1978). Performance, attitudes, and professional socialization of women in academia. Sex Roles, 4:4, 549-563.

Author Notes

The authors wish to acknowledge the help of Graduate Assistant Karin Marsick in preparing the data for processing and in the literature search.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Self-Ratings of Productivity

	Past	Present	Future
Productivity area	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Teaching	7.6 (1.3)	7.7 (1.2)	7.8 (1.2)
Scholarship	5.5 (2.1)	5.7 (2.3)	6.3 (2.0)
Service	6.9 (1.8)	7.3 (1.7)	7.1 (1.6)

Note. N = 390.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Self-Ratings of Scholarship by Age

	Age Group			
	Young	Middle	Old	
Time of scholarship	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	F (df = 2,336)
Past	5.9 (2.0)	5.2 (2.1)	5.8 (1.9)	4.43*
Present	6.2 (2.0)	5.5 (2.3)	5.6 (2.4)	3.31*
Future	7.0 (1.4)	6.2 (1.9)	5.8 (2.4)	7.72**

Notes. *$p < .05$ **$p < .001$.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Self-Ratings of Productivity by Gender

	Gender			
	Male	Female		
Productivity areas and times	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	F	df
Teaching				
Past	7.6 (1.2)	7.6 (1.3)	<1	1,334
Present	7.5 (1.3)	7.9 (1.1)	6.84**	
Future	7.8 (1.2)	8.0 (1.0)	4.37*	
Scholarship				
Past	5.6 (2.0)	5.2 (2.2)	3.92*	1,336
Present	5.6 (2.3)	5.9 (2.3)	<1	
Future	6.3 (2.0)	6.5 (3.8)	<1	

(table continues)

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Self-Ratings of Productivity by Gender (continued)

	Gender			
	Male	Female		
Productivity areas and times	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	F	df
Service				
Past	7.0 (1.8)	6.8 (2.0)	1.78	1,259
Present	7.1 (1.7)	7.5 (1.6)	3.79*	
Future	6.9 (1.7)	7.3 (1.4)	2.78	

Notes. *$p < .05$ **$p < .001$.

Table 4

Changes in Conceptions of Productivity for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

Response	Teaching		Scholarship		Service	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
No Mention	96	50.0	94	49.0	123	64.1
No Change	45	23.4	10	5.2	11	5.7
Increased importance	22	11.5	66	34.4	44	22.9
Decreased importance	29	15.1	22	11.5	14	7.3
Total	192	100.0	192	100.0	192	100.0

Table 5

Changes of Conceptions of Scholarship by Gender

	Gender			
	Male		Female	
Response	f	%	f	%
No Mention	59	47	34	54
No Change	4	3	5	8
Positive	42	33	23	37
Negative	21	17	1	1
Total	126	100	63	100

Note. $\chi^2 = 10.8$, df = 3, $p < .05$.

N = 189, Missing Cases 201, (52%).

Table 6

Changing Conceptions of Service by Age

	Age					
	<40		40 - 54		55+	
Response	f	%	f	%	f	%
No Mention	27	57	64	62	32	78
No Change	6	13	4	4	1	2
Positive	13	28	28	27	3	7
Negative	1	2	8	8	5	12
Total	47	100	104	100	41	100

Note. $\chi^2 = 15.8$, df = 6, $p < .05$.

N = 192, Missing Cases = 198 (51%).

Table 7

Perceptions of the Effect of Institutional Policies on Productivity by Rank

	Rank					
	Assistant		Associate		Full	
Response	f	%	f	%	f	%
Positive	8	10	11	10	35	25
Negative	41	53	54	47	55	39
Positive & Negative	26	33	43	38	43	30
No Effect	3	4	6	5	9	6
Total	78	100	114	100	142	100

Note. $\chi^2 = 15.1$, df = 6, $p < .05$.

N = 334, Missing Cases = 56 (14%).

Appendix

FACULTY CAREER SURVEY

1. Productivity can mean different things to different people. When you think of your own job, what does being productive mean to you?

2. Has your conception of productivity changed since you first took an academic job? (Please circle 1 or 2)

   1. No
   2. Yes

   If yes, please explain how it has changed:

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY
1983 EAST 24TH STREET
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44115

Developed 1983 by:

E. M. Schuttenberg
L. E. Patterson
R. S. Sutton

Most colleges and universities have a three-fold mission: Scholarship (which includes research and writing for publication), Teaching (which includes curriculum design and classroom instruction), and Service (which includes service to the institution, the profession, and the community). Individual faculty members can be productive in varying degrees in each of these areas.

3. First, in terms of Scholarship, how would you rate your productivity? (Please circle one number for each item)

   a. Since you assumed your first full-time college faculty position?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Low High

   b. In the past year and the year just beginning?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Low High

   c. As anticipated in the future, from now until your retirement?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Low High

4. Second, in terms of Teaching, how would you rate your productivity?

   a. Since you assumed your first full time college faculty position?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Low High

   b. In the past year and the year just beginning?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Low High

   c. As anticipated in the future, from now until your retirement?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Low High

5. Third, in terms of Service, how would you rate your productivity?

   a. Since you assumed your first full time college faculty position?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Low High

   b. In the past year and the year just beginning?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Low High

   c. As anticipated in the future, from now until retirement?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Low High

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6. How likely is it that you will receive a promotion or attain a more desirable position within your own institution within the next two or three years?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Unlikely								Very Likely

7. How interested are you in seeking another position in higher education, outside your present institution, within the next two or three years?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Uninterested								Very Interested

8. If you were to seek another position in higher education within the next two or three years, how likely would you be to attain a desirable one?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Unlikely								Very Likely

9. In your career to date, how satisfied are you with your accomplishments?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Very Unsatisfied								Very Satisfied

10. Colleges and Universities vary greatly in the kinds of institutional procedures they employ, and these can affect the productivity of faculty members. What effects, positive and negative, have your institutions' procedures had on your ability to be productive?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. Age _____

12. Sex

1. Male
2. Female

LIBRARY 1980 1218

13. Academic Rank (please circle one number)

    1. Instructor
    2. Assistant professor
    3. Associate Professor
    4. Professor
    5. Other, please explain _____

14. Do you presently hold tenure?

    1. Yes
    2. No

15. Main Field of Expertise (please circle one number)

    1. Teacher Education (Early Childhood Education; Elementary/Secondary)
    2. Educational Psychology/Research
    3. Counselor Education
    4. School Administration
    5. Special Education
    6. Adult Education/Higher Education
    7. Other, please explain _____

16. How many years have you held a full time college faculty position? _____

17. How many years have you been employed at your present institution? _____

18. How many years have you held your present academic rank?

    _____

19. Is there anything else you would like to add?

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE